

III. Remarks

Responsive to the outstanding Examiner's Action, the Applicants have carefully studied the Examiner's comments. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the following detailed discussion.

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11-18 are rejected. Claims 7 and 10 are objected to. Claims 1, 5, 12, 13, 14, 17 and 18 have been amended. Claim 7 is requested to be cancelled. No new matter has been added. A listing of the claims, along with a status indicator of each claim, appears above.

The Examiner objected to originally filed Figs. 1 and 2 as a variety of reference numbers and one lead line needed to be amended. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's careful attention to the figures. Applicants are submitting herewith two Replacement Sheets containing Figs. 1 and 2. No new matter has been added to the application with these Replacement Sheets.

The Examiner also objected to several paragraphs in the specification. Again, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's comments and the specification has been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections.

Claims 5-7, 10, 11 and 17 were objected to as they contained typographical errors. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's suggestions and the claims have been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 12-14 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 12-14 and 18 have been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejections. Claims 14 and 18 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner and the Applicants appreciate the Examiner's suggestions.

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11-13 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over La Rock, Jr. in view of Porsche et al. Additionally, claims 1-4, 8, 9, 12 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over La Rock Jr. in view of Ziech et al. Lastly, claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over La Rock Jr. in view of Porsche et al or Ziech et al as applied previously in the action and further in view of Tomida. The Examiner indicated claims 7 and 10 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Finally, the Examiner indicated claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, in the action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Independent claims 1, 17 and 18 have been amended to include the limitation that at least one dampening structure, or shock absorber in claim 18, is pivotally mounted to an upper king pin bracket, where the upper king pin bracket comprises a rear suspension linkage attachment portion. The art cited, whether combined or taken individually, does not make obvious an invention as defined in the independent claims including the limitation of at least one dampening structure pivotally mounted to an upper king pin bracket where the upper kin pin bracket comprises a rear suspension linkage attachment portion. This limitation was defined in originally filed dependent claim 7 which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In light of the above discussion and the amendments to independent claims 1, 17 and 18, amended claims 1, 17 and 18 of the present invention are patentable. Furthermore, claims 2-16 each depend on amended claim 1, either directly or indirectly, and contain all of the limitations

Serial No. 10/614,232
7039 CVDA
1-16143

thereof. Therefore, because amended claim 1 is patentable and claims 2-16 each depend on amended claim 1, claims 2-16 are patentable over the cited references.

In light of the remarks above, it is believed the claims are now in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner wish to modify any of the language of the claims, Applicants' attorney suggests a telephone interview in order to expedite the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen P. Evans
Registration No. 47,281

ATTORNEYS

Marshall & Melhorn, LLC
Four SeaGate, Eighth Floor
Toledo, OH 43604
ph: (419) 249-7100
fax: (419) 249-7151